



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ARTICLE III.

REMARKS ON THE POLITICAL CONDITION AND  
PROSPECTS OF EUROPE.

BY THE EDITOR.

IT is not our design to attempt a full view of the political relations of the different governments of Europe ; nor to enter into any discussion of some of the great questions involved in the present condition of European affairs. Our design is more limited and special. We wish to show what there is in the influences that have been at work for the last forty years, and in the present political and social aspects of Europe, to justify the hope, that that portion of the world is not destined again to be the theatre of such general and bloody conflicts as it has exhibited. We wish at least to indicate the causes by which the policy of Europe has been essentially modified ; and to appreciate the influences which favor or retard the ultimate triumph of freedom and of public order, and the final adoption of a pacific international policy.

The French revolution is rich in all manner of instruction to the thoughtful observer of human nature, and of the progress of society. It is the true point of departure from which to estimate the progress, the present condition and future prospects of Europe. No just and philosophical view of these subjects can be formed which does not proceed upon a true apprehension of that period, its causes and its effects. Every great movement of society and of government has been directly or indirectly affected by it ; its influences are yet far from being exhausted ; its lessons are far from being all gathered up.

We have before adverted\* to the influence of the career of Napoleon in creating a reaction against the spirit of war and conquest. This reaction was felt both by the people and by the

\* Advocate of Peace, No. I. p. 8, 9. Also Address before the Hartford County Society, p. 22, 23.

governments; and the declaration of the Allied Sovereigns after the fall of Napoleon, was the public and solemn expression of it. We intimated our opinion, that if those great powers, while solemnly declaring themselves against the principle of conquest, and revolutionary propagandism, had at the same time taken the right ground, and been just to the true principle of rational freedom, the repose of Europe might have been secured. Then was the moment for them to have taken a position by which they would have had with them the moral force of Europe, and been able to maintain peace among the nations, repose and harmony between the people and their governments. But they failed to do this, and left the elements of discontent, resistance and future conflict, to rankle beneath the surface of that temporary repose which was due to exhaustion, to the general feeling of disgust at the perpetual convulsions produced by individual ambition, and finally to the triumph of the allied arms. It is not at all difficult to explain the course pursued by the Allied Powers. It was a time of moral reaction. Every such reaction contains an element of truth; and every such reaction likewise goes too far. But we shall be better able to explain our views if we go back a little.

The French revolution, out of which sprung Napoleon and the sources of his power, and the wars which followed, had, in its origin, along with whatever other concurrent causes and conditions there may have been, *an element of truth*, with its necessary foundation in reason and human nature. It was the reaction of reason and the principle of liberty against the spirit of despotism. But in the excess of this reaction, the true principle of rational freedom was immediately falsified, carried out to the absurd and fanatical doctrines of Jacobinism, and mixed up with other atrocious and anarchical elements,—the whole destructive to public order, to all the just ends of government and to all true liberty. Hence followed, at home, those revolting scenes of anarchy and atrocity, under the temporary ascendancy and succession of turbulent and brutal leaders, so truly named the reign of terror; while, abroad, the fanaticism of revolutionary propagandism was seen forcing freedom upon

other nations at the point of the bayonet—the despotism of liberty—a striking illustration of the old truth, that extremes meet.

Against the doctrines and spirit of that period, so false and dangerous, it was natural that the old governments of Europe, by interest and habit favorable to order, and to the established condition of things, should revolt. When, subsequently, the career of Napoleon, the child of the revolution, combined against him all the sovereigns of Europe, nothing was more natural than that strong reaction against the spirit of war and conquest—that public and solemn reprobation, pronounced in the hour of their triumph, upon the boundless selfishness of that military ambition by which Europe had for so many years been convulsed. And nothing was more natural than that this hour should be crowded with recollections of the preceding twenty-five years; that they should go back to the remoter causes of those stupendous convulsions by which every thing ancient, and fixed, and sacred had been shaken or overthrown—the principles of Jacobinism, democracy, and revolutionary fanaticism. It was natural not only that the idea of revolution should be associated with every thing odious, with every thing dangerous to the welfare and repose of Europe, but that Liberty itself should be a word of fear and hatred. To render it odious was their wish and aim. They were unjust to the rightful demands of the free spirit. They made no distinction between the false and anarchical doctrines of Jacobinism, and the true principle of freedom. Upon the latter they charged all the atrocities and convulsions of the former. In their fear and hatred, they overlooked every element of truth in what they feared and hated. The spirit and determination of despotism was strengthened. They exaggerated the true principles of order and legitimacy, to a false and unjust absolutism. They saw but one way to preserve the peace of Europe—by restoring as far as possible the ancient order of things, and maintaining that order by force. The hour of their triumph over Napoleon—the impersonation of the spirit of conquest and military glory—the disturber of the peace of Europe, was, likewise, the

hour of their triumph over the child of the revolution—the subverter of thrones and dynasties, who, but for the dangerous doctrines of liberty, would never have risen up to terrify and humble the far-descended kings “*by the grace of God.*” Order and legitimacy were then to be established, as the only conservative principles; the spirit of liberty and revolution, rendered as odious as they could possibly represent it, by referring to it all the atrocities and miseries of the foregoing period, and without any discrimination of the true from the false, and without any concession to its just demands, was to be repressed and kept down by the strong hand. Hence the doctrine first broached at the Congress of Laybach, and afterwards solemnly established at the congress of Vienna: “that every monarch has a right to interfere in the internal concerns of foreign nations.” Hence the right of armed intervention, so called, (*droit d'intervention armée*)—the propagandism of absolutism. Hence, finally, the causes of hatred, conflict and war, between governments and the people, from that time to the present, and destined still to disturb the peace of Europe for many years to come. If, now, while denouncing the spirit of Jacobinism, revolutionary propagandism and conquest, they had abstained from asserting the doctrines of absolutism and armed intervention, and had in good faith met the reasonable demands of the free spirit, must we not believe they might have guaranteed the permanent peace of Europe, or at least made its condition quite different from what it has been and is probably destined to be for an indefinite period to come? They would certainly have had with them the opinions of all the just, the moderate and enlightened, in support of order and the principles of a wise and just expediency, as the foundation of government and national welfare, and in opposition to the false and dangerous doctrines of a theoretical equality and of unqualified democracy. But by the false, impolitic and unjust position they assumed, they deprived themselves of all the best portion of the moral force of Europe, which they might otherwise have had with them in the work of repressing and putting down the false and fanatical spirit and doctrines of Jacobinism, which is

indeed but another name for anarchy, for every thing destructive to law, to order, and to national well-being. But they lost the golden opportunity. They did not wisely improve their victory. They did not turn to permanent advantage the moral reaction produced by the excesses and crimes of the French revolution, and by the subsequent convulsions and calamities to which the profligate ambition of Napoleon had subjected all Europe. By their injustice towards the spirit of true and reasonable freedom, by their unjust exaggeration of the true principles of order and legitimacy, they left the elements of future conflict, smouldering beneath the surface of a forced and artificial quiet; elements which have since been perpetually breaking out in resistance, revolution and revolutionary attempts.

While, however, we cannot but deplore that the Allied Sovereigns should have perverted so favorable an opportunity of proclaiming together, both the doctrines of liberty and of public order, in their integrity and mutual harmony, and thus securing the pacification of Europe, we ought at the same time to be just, to human nature and to history. Let us recognize the good, which, under God, has actually been wrought out from those stupendous scenes of conflict and evil. Let us trust, too, that the human mind is not destined forever to swing, like a pendulum, from one extreme of reaction to another. It must certainly be admitted that through those scenes, the cause of truth and of peace has gained progress. Wars of *conquest*, we may believe, will not in Europe be any more sanctioned. The integrity of existing states is permanently guaranteed. In regard to the internal conflicts between governments and the people, between the despotic and the free spirit, there are many grounds of confidence in the ultimate triumph and peaceful establishment of the truth. The struggle which is going on in Europe is a conflict of principles. It is a war of ideas. It is an opposition between the spirit of despotism and of liberty, deep, bitter, and determined. On the part of despotism, it is an inextinguishable hostility to liberal principles, affecting not only the movements of government, but betrayed in all the re-

lations of social life. Thus in France, the inquietude which was kept perpetually fermenting beneath the brilliant surface of French society, during the period between the restoration and the revolution of 1830, may justly be regarded as one of the remoter causes of that event, and of the measures by which the scenes of the Three Days were precipitated. Returning from exile with the king, or gathering around him from the obscurity to which former events had reduced them, came all the representatives of a past age, the supporters of despotism, the lovers of the ancient order of things, the haters of revolution and of that odious liberty by which they had suffered so many losses and humiliations. With little comprehension of, and no sympathy with, the changes that time and events had wrought in the great mass of the French people, they could not conceal their arrogant exultation, nor enjoy with moderation what they felt as the triumph of legitimacy and aristocracy. This imprudent insolence was deeply felt on the other part. "There was," says the Count de SELLON, in explaining the views of M. de SALVANDI,\* "an absence of security to the heirs of the revolution of 1789, who were disturbed with the vague fear of being dispossessed, if not of their material possessions, yet of their respectability, their social position and consideration. They saw with grief and indignation, certain tokens of contempt, which are easily betrayed by French vivacity. They were frozen by the expression : *nobody*, (*homme de rein*) applied to those who had not illustrious birth, an expression immediately hawked about (*colportée*) by those pests of society who delight only in discord and evil. Napoleon, on the contrary, had sought to substitute, in place of the chimerical equality of the revolution of 1789, the only reasonable equality to be desired in France, or in Europe at large, the hope, namely, *held out to every body, of rising by one's own merit*." With this latter principle, however, the only just prin-

\* In his recent work entitled *Seize Mois*. We have translated the passage from M. de Sellon's *Recueil de Lettres adressees aux Archives de la Societe de la Paix*: Collection of Letters addressed to the Archives of the Geneva Peace Society.

ciple of aristocracy, as the title to the distinctions and prizes of society, and of government, the absolutists and favorers of the *ancien regime* were as little satisfied, as with the chimerical and absurd doctrine of equality of 1789. And how fatally wanting in a just and wise policy, was the restored Bourbon government, the events of the Three Days demonstrated. The French government, though with an insincere and vacillating policy, in many respects, on the part of the king, is now essentially liberal. The spirit of liberty has secured, we may believe, its permanent triumph. Though the fermentation has not entirely subsided, the force, moral and physical, is on the side of freedom. The contest in Spain and Portugal is nearly terminated in favor of liberal principles. The recent quadruple alliance of England, France, Spain and Portugal, places these four powers together on the side of liberty. On the side of despotism, the governments of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, are leagued together in the most determined hostility, to the progress of liberal principles. If we look over Europe, we shall find the explanation of every thing that is most interesting in its political and social aspects, in this deep and pervading struggle between the principles of despotism and of liberty. The revolutions of Poland and Italy have been crushed by the overwhelming force of Russian and Austrian power; but the Polish spirit is unconquerable; and in Italy, as in Germany, the free spirit, though kept down by all the restraints of Austrian despotism, is alive and struggling unsubdued. Against this spirit, the great powers of despotism are united, with the most determined and desperate energy. "As long as I live," says the Emperor of Russia, "I will oppose a will of iron to the progress of liberal opinions. The present generation is lost, but we must labor with zeal and earnestness, to improve the spirit of that to come. It may require a hundred years; I am not unreasonable, I give you a whole age, but you must work without relaxation."

The contest then will go on. On the part of despotism, every resource will be exhausted in the effort to extinguish the spirit of liberty. But the spirit is inextinguishable. It is des-



tined to prevail. The contest may be long and fierce ; but the triumph of freedom is sure. We believe this, not only because it is the triumph of truth which we predict, but because clearly, the elements of victory are with the friends of liberty ; they have with them the power, the moral and physical force of Europe. The free principle has gained strength from the conflicts of former times ; it has made a decided progress, while the hold of despotism over the general mind, through imagination and habit, if not broken, is yet in many ways greatly impaired. The idea and desire of liberty is extensively awakened, through all classes of the great body of the people. The spectacle of free governments is perpetually before them ; many rights have already been gained, and in the most despotic governments, a moral force has been gradually springing up, the result of many causes, against which the influences of despotism will be unavailing. It deserves, moreover, special consideration, that the free principle has become greatly purified. It is not now falsified by exaggeration and the fanatic and anarchical spirit and doctrines, which prevailed in connection with it, in the early period of the French revolution. It is freed from those atrocious and dangerous elements. The disgusting alliance of liberty with Jacobinism and atheism, which indeed rendered it destructive to social welfare, is broken up. How much progress the true spirit of liberty has made in purifying itself from exaggeration and false mixtures, may be seen in the French revolution of 1830. How entirely unlike the wild licentiousness of 1789 ! It was not the reign of anarchy, of mob domination. It was controlled by watchwords, the very sound of which in 1789, would have subjected the utterers to the guillotine, or to be torn in pieces by the frantic fury of the fishwomen. *Liberty* AND *Law and Public Order*, were the watchwords perpetually reiterated by the leaders of the revolution of 1830, and kept distinctly before the minds of the people. Despotism is thus deprived of the great source of its moral power, that which gave it its justest grounds and fairest pretexts for crushing the spirit of liberty by force, the atrocities namely, perpetrated under the sacred name of liberty. It

cannot now, as formerly, succeed in rendering free principles odious to the just and moderate, the lovers of law and order. It cannot point to the horrors of 1789 as the *only*, the legitimate and *necessary* fruits of the free spirit. It cannot open the sheltering arms of absolutism as the *only* refuge against anarchy and violence. The inference in both cases will be denied. The distinction between liberty and anarchy will be readily admitted; it has been impressively taught by terrible lessons. The friends of freedom are ready to allow, that wild, unbridled licentiousness, under the specious names of liberty and equality, is fraught with a thousand fold more curses to the people, than the most iron despotism; that freedom is no blessing without public order, virtue and religion. But they hold that freedom does not necessarily imply the unbridled and licentious domination of the ignorant mob, nor even a democracy; that a free government may be consistent with the supremacy of law, which is far better than despotism; that it may be as consistent with subordination and public order as a despotism, and with far less danger to human welfare. Thus purified, the true principles of freedom will enlist a continually increasing force of opinion among the moderate and enlightened. It will move onward to its triumph, with a march which despotism may indeed resist and retard, but can never defeat.

In this conflict between despotism and liberty, Europe may be destined for generations to come, to be the theatre of violent and bloody wars. It would be presumptuous to predict on this subject, with any tone of confidence. We have no doubt, indeed, that there will be a fierce and determined struggle; that there will be violent internal agitation in the several countries where despotism is predominant. Still, we cannot but believe that the issue is to be determined by the gradual force of opinion, rather than by arms. At least we cannot believe that this conflict will involve such general, protracted, and bloody wars between different nations, as have been witnessed in past times in Europe. In case of a conflict between any people and its government, the allied powers of despotism have many reasons to be cautious in practically asserting the doctrine of

armed intervention. For in spite of them, the right of revolution has gained the footing of an established principle. They have been compelled practically to acquiesce in it. It cannot be put down. Four of the great powers of Europe are likewise now united on the side of liberal principles, and in defence of the right of revolution. The doctrine of armed intervention is of as ready application by them as by the propagandists of absolutism and anti-revolution who proclaimed it. England and France, it is true, stood aloof during the Polish struggle; the late minister, Casimir Perrier, explicitly declared himself against the doctrine of armed intervention. But this ground has, since then, been abandoned. The attitude taken by these powers must, we think, act as a restraint upon the movements of the despotic sovereigns; tend to diminish the likelihood of general wars; limit very much their intervention in the internal concerns of other nations; and, combined with many influences due to the general progress of mankind, make the conflict between despotism and liberty, a conflict as between the people and their respective governments; which finally, though not perhaps without violence and blood, will yet mainly be decided by the prevalence of truth, that moral force of enlightened opinion, before which despotism must yield and disappear, even as other monstrous and exploded errors, that long shackled the human mind, and retarded the progress of human nature.

Be this however, as it may, one thing is certain, that if this conflict were decided, there would be no more ground in Europe for wars of principle. What, in fact, has been the cause of all the wars there, since the downfall of Napoleon? They have grown out of the opposition of the despotic and free spirit. This explains them all. But for this, Europe would at this moment be in a state of profound peace.—Still more, therefore, may we confidently expect that whenever this conflict shall be decided by the triumph of the principles of true and reasonable freedom, purified from all licentious mixture, and consequently securing public order and the internal repose of nations,—then also, *a peaceful international policy will*

*prevail.* For there will remain no grounds of difference except such as grow out of the commercial relations of different nations. Differences of this sort, even now, are almost entirely settled by negotiation. Arbitration is sometimes resorted to; and the feeling is very general that such differences are never worth a *war*, that to resort to war is the very poorest way for either party. Especially is this the case with an industrious and commercial people. These interests are, in a large view, always injuriously affected by war. The true element of their prosperity is peace. The immense increase of the industrious and commercial interests is one of the main causes of those vast changes which have taken place in the political and social relations of Europe. Hence many of those improvements in international law, designed to secure those interests against the injurious effects, and to mitigate the necessary severities of war. The changes wrought by the increase of industry and commerce are all in favor of peace. These interests all rejoice in protection against the fluctuation and insecurity of a state of war.—The interests of the great body of the people of Europe are then averse to war. In proportion, therefore, as the governments become free, not only will the present great and chief cause, we may say the only actual cause of war, the opposition of despotism and liberty, be removed, but we may confidently reckon on a continual extension and consolidation of a peaceful policy, as demanded by enlightened views of the true interests of all parties.

Such are our views concerning the final termination of the great struggle by which Europe is agitated; and such our views of its consequences in regard to war. How long before this desirable consummation will be realized, it is not for us to say.

In the mean time, there are some proofs at present of the prevalence of just, enlightened, and Christian views on the subject of war, among the leading minds of Europe, which we wish to present to our readers.—In a speech delivered August 5, 1830, Lord BROUGHAM thus expresses himself:

“But my principles,—and I know not whether they agree with

yours,—they may be derided, they may be unfashionable, but I hope they are spreading far and wide,—my principles are contained in the words which that great man [Lord Falkland] was used to express in secret, and which I now express in public: ‘Peace, Peace, Peace.’ I abominate war as unchristian. I hold it the greatest of human crimes. I deem it to include all others, violence, blood, rapine, fraud, every thing which can deform the character, alter the nature, and debase the name of man.”

At the Mansion House, February 18th, 1832, EARL GREY delivered the following sentiment:—

“He entertained a sanguine, he might say a perfect hope, that the peace of Europe would be preserved. He fully agreed with those who thought that the time had passed away, when we should be induced to think that any two nations could regard each other as *natural enemies*.\* He hoped that *impolitic, unwise, and unchristian* maxim was giving way to that enlightened policy which would suggest to us notions that each was interested in the prosperity of the other, and that the only rivalry which ought to subsist between them, was an emulation in the arts, and an anxiety to surpass each other in the improvement of every social institution.”

Upon this sentiment, the London *Morning Chronicle* makes the following remarks:—

“The time, we trust, is not far distant, when the best security for the preservation of peace, will be sought for in the conviction carefully implanted in the different nations of the European commonwealth, that they are all deeply interested in the prosperity of each other; and that, consequently, war must always be injurious, and never beneficial to them. When this conviction once becomes general, it will be found that the greatest publicity with regard to all affairs of an international character, is the best protection against the machinations of the barbarous governments which still deface Europe. It was a conviction of this kind, which induced one of the profound and cautious philosophers of Europe to connect the possibility of perpetual peace with the general existence of representative governments alone; because, were the conviction general, that nations never can have an interest in war, those who represent nations must act on such a conviction.”

To these extracts, we are happy to add likewise the following views, expressed by the late Prime Minister of France, CASI-

\* Compare this with Lord Nelson’s frequent coarse and brutal expressions of malignity and deadly hatred against the French, in regard to whom, he seemed to think himself absolved from all obligation of exercising the spirit universally required by Christianity.

**MER PERRIER.** They are part of a speech delivered in the Chamber of Deputies, March 7th, 1832.

“In the actual state of civilization, none of these questions [of commercial or territorial interest] on which any two nations can be brought into collision, is sufficient in policy to justify a war between them; especially, when it is recollected, that in consequence of the complications of every sort, created by this same civilization between the interests of different nations, there can be no partial war which does not run the risk of becoming almost immediately a general war.

“In such a state of things,” he proceeds, “it is evident, that *what has already been resorted to in the actual processes of diplomacy, CONFERENCES, are a necessity of civilization*; and one of its most honorable fruits, since their object is to consecrate the triumph of reason over force. Is it not, in fact, much better for nations to understand each other before going to war, than to begin by fighting, and end by explaining themselves?”

In this connection, we give also copies of letters received by the Count de Sella, in acknowledgment of communications made by him respecting the Society, of which he is the founder. They are not only gratifying as the declared dispositions of the distinguished personages by whom they are written, on the subject of war in general, but they indicate also the respectful consideration which the special exertions of the friends of peace have met with from some, who, by their position, have it in their power greatly to accelerate the progress of true principles.

The first is from Casimer Perrier :—\*

Cabinet of the Minister of the Interior.

*Paris, the 5th April, 1831.*

“SIR,—I have received with sincere pleasure the Constitution of the Geneva Peace Society, which you have done me the honor to address to me. The honorable object at which it aims, under your auspices, gives it a claim upon the gratitude of nations. It is with pleasure, Sir, I acknowledge to you, on this particular occasion, all the interest that I feel in its progress, and thank you, personally, for the high regard which you have expressed for me.

\* These letters were originally published in the *Archives de la Societe' de la Paix, de Geneve*; we copy them, however, from the London Herald of Peace. The originals are in French, as given on the next page.

"Accept, Sir, the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

*President of the Council, Minister, Secretary of State of the Interior.*  
CASIMER PERRIER."

The second is from the King of Prussia :—

*Berlin, the 27th April, 1831.*

"SIR,—All your writings and all your undertakings are inspired by the love of mankind, and bear the impress of true religion. This character, which has for so long a time distinguished you, claims all my esteem. The undertaking of which you inform us, should obtain the approbation and encouragement of all who feel an interest in the happiness of man. It is, doubtless, difficult to triumph over the errors and passions which are opposed to the noble design at which you aim ; but it is delightful to reach after, and to labor for it, without intermission. Peace is more than ever the duty of governments, as well as the interest of the people. Both have need of it, for it is the first condition of the happiness of every State. To maintain and to preserve it, without compromising the dignity and the safety of the monarchy with which Providence has entrusted me, has been, and always shall be, the object of all my wishes and my endeavors ; and my thoughts always accord with, in this respect, those which a holy policy, in harmony with Christianity, makes you desire to realize.

"Receive the assurance of my consideration.

FREDERICK WILLIAM."

The next is from the Prince of Denmark :—

*Copenhagen the 31st May, 1831.*

"MONSIEUR LE COMTE,—I have had the benefit of receiving the Constitution of the Geneva Peace Society, which you have been

Cabinet du Ministre de l'Intérieur.

*Paris, le 5 Avril, 1831.*

"MONSIEUR,—J'ai reçu avec un plaisir sincère le Règlement de la Société de la Paix, de Genève, que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'adresser. Le but honorable qu'elle s'est proposé, sous vos auspices, lui donne droit à la reconnaissance des nations. Je me plais, Monsieur, à vous témoigner dans cette circonstance tout l'intérêt que je porte à ses progrès, en vous remerciant personnellement de l'hommage que vous avez bien voulu me faire.

"Agréez, Monsieur, l'assurance de ma considération très-distinguée.

*Le Président du Conseil, Ministre, Secrétaire d'Etat de l'Intérieur.*

CASIMER PERRIER."

*Berlin, le 27 Avril, 1831.*

"MONSIEUR,—Tous vos écrits et toutes vos entreprises vous sont inspirés par l'amour de l'humanité, et portent le sceau de la véritable religion. Ce caractère qui vous distingue vous a depuis long-temps acquis toute mon estime. L'entreprise que vous annoncez doit obtenir l'approbation et les encouragemens de tous ceux qui s'intéressent au bonheur des hommes. Il est sans doute, difficile de triompher des erreurs et des passions qui s'opposent au

kindly disposed to address to me, dated the 16th April. I do full justice to the sentiments which have engaged you, M. Le Comte, to promote the establishment of this society ; and I am very thankful to you for having enabled me to appreciate its design and organization.

“Accept, M. Le Comte, the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.  
CHRISTIAN FREDERICK.”

These declared dispositions of leading statesmen and sovereigns of Europe are certainly gratifying to the philanthropist, and to the Christian. If with these expressions we combine the considerations before adverted to, the naturally pacific influence of the growing industrious and commercial interests of christendom,—the increase of *negotiation*, and the instances of *arbitration* between nations which have already been witnessed, there seems good reason to believe that, but for the conflict between despotism and liberty, the peace of Europe would not be disturbed ;—that a pacific policy might be consolidated on a permanent basis. Is it too much to believe that some general confederacy might be formed among the nations of christendom,—some method adopted of adjusting the differences that might arise between them without resort to arms ? Is it visionary to think that some extension and modification of international law, might be effected, some international tribunal

---

noble but que vous vous proposez ; mais il est beau d'y tendre, et d'y travailler, sans relâche. La paix est plus que jamais dans les devoirs des gouvernemens comme dans les intérêts des peuples. Les uns et les autres en ont besoin, car elle est la première condition du bonheur de tous les états. La maintenir et la conserver, sans compromettre la dignité et la sûreté de la monarchie que la Providence m'a confiée, a été, et sera toujours, l'objet de tous mes vœux et de tous mes efforts, et mes pensées rencontreront toujours à cet égard celles que la saine politique, d'accord avec le Christianisme, vous fait désirer de réaliser.

“Recevez l'assurance de ma considération.

FREDERIC-GUILLAUME.”

*Copenhagen, ce 31 Mai, 1831.*

“MONSIEUR LE COMTE,—J'ai eu l'avantage de recevoir le Règlement de la Société de la Paix de Geneve, que vous avez bien voulu m'adresser, en date du 16 Avril. Je rends parfaitement justice aux sentimens qui vous ont engagé, M. le Comte, à provoquer la création de cette Société ; et je vous suis très-reconnaissant de m'avoir mis à même d'en apprécier le but et l'organisation.

“Agréez, M. le Comte, l'assurance de ma considération très distinguée.  
CHRISTIAN FREDERIC.”



established, which should supercede that brutal resort to force, which certainly is utterly incompetent to secure a just decision? Let it be borne in mind, that *the elements of such a system already exist*, in the policy of christendom. They exist in the processes of *arbitration*, already more than once resorted to with success. They exist in those *conferences*, which have become almost a settled feature of European policy, which in the language of Perrier, already quoted, "are a necessity of civilization." For ourselves, we cannot question that if the deep and pervading cause of conflict which we have attempted to explain, were removed, it would not be difficult to direct the attention of governments to this great object. And even in the present state of things, we cannot but think that if our government were to instruct its ambassadors at foreign courts, to invite the representatives of other governments to consider the practicability of so extending international law as to embrace some system of conference and arbitration for the settlement of differences, and the prevention of war, the proposal would be respectfully met; and an important step would be gained in the formal bringing forward of the subject, even though the causes before adverted to, should, for the present, prevent any definite result.

That the eyes of the nations and governments of christendom will sooner or later be directed to this object, we have no doubt. We are equally persuaded, that the nation which leads the way in this grand triumph of reason and Christianity, over brute passion and barbarism, will cover itself with a true glory, that shall enlarge and brighten, down through all coming time, when the glory of the warrior and conqueror, however "highly esteemed among men" now, shall have faded entirely away, with all that is "abominable in the eyes of the Lord."